



Genetic differentiation and the evolution of cooperation in chimpanzees and humans

Citation

Langergraber, K., G. Schubert, C. Rowney, R. Wrangham, Z. Zommers, and L. Vigilant. 2011. Genetic Differentiation and the Evolution of Cooperation in Chimpanzees and Humans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 278 (1717): 2546–2552.

Published Version

doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.2592

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:12712849>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Genetic differentiation and the evolution of cooperation in chimpanzees and humans



Journal:	<i>Proceedings B</i>
Manuscript ID:	RSPB-2010-2592.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Langergraber, Kevin; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Primatology Schubert, Gritchen; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Primatology Rowney, Carolyn; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Primatology Wrangham, Richard; Harvard University, Human Evolutionary Biology Zommers, Zinta; University of Oxford, Zoology Vigilant, Linda; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Primatology
Subject:	Behaviour < BIOLOGY, Evolution < BIOLOGY, Molecular Biology < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	chimpanzees, Pan troglodytes, group competition, hunter-gatherer, altruism, warfare
Proceedings B category:	Evolutionary Biology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 Genetic differentiation and the evolution of cooperation in chimpanzees and humans

2

3 Kevin Langergraber^{1,2}

4 Grit Schubert¹

5 Carolyn Rowney¹

6 Richard Wrangham³

7 Zinta Zommers⁴

8 Linda Vigilant¹

9

10 ¹ Primatology Department, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher
11 Platz 6, Leipzig 04103, Germany

12 ² Department of Anthropology, Boston University, 235 Bay State Road, Boston, MA
13 02215, USA

14 ³ Department of Human Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Peabody Museum, 11
15 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

16 ⁴ Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, The Recanati-Kaplan Centre, Tubney House,
17 Abingdon Road, Tubney, Abingdon OX13 5QL, UK

18 SUMMARY

19 It has been proposed that human cooperation is unique among animals for its scale and
20 complexity, its altruistic nature, and its occurrence among large groups of individuals that
21 are not closely related or are even strangers. One potential solution to this puzzle is that the
22 unique aspects of human cooperation evolved as a result of high levels of lethal competition
23 (i.e., warfare) between genetically differentiated groups. Although between-group migration
24 would seem to make this scenario unlikely, the plausibility of the between-group competition
25 model has recently been supported by analyses using estimates of genetic differentiation
26 derived from contemporary human groups hypothesized to be representative of those that
27 existed during the time period when human cooperation evolved. Here we examine levels of
28 between-group genetic differentiation in a large sample of contemporary human groups
29 selected to overcome some of the problems with earlier estimates, and compare them with
30 those of chimpanzees. We find that our estimates of between-group genetic differentiation in
31 contemporary humans are lower than those used in previous tests, and not higher than those
32 of chimpanzees. Because levels of between-group competition in contemporary humans and
33 chimpanzees are also similar, these findings suggest that the identification of other factors
34 which differ between chimpanzees and humans may be needed to provide a compelling
35 explanation of why humans, but not chimpanzees, display the unique features of human
36 cooperation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Human cooperation is apparently unique among vertebrates in its combination of three features: the large number of individuals that can cooperate together, the high frequency of cooperation that involves individuals incurring a cost to their personal reproduction (i.e., ‘altruistic’ cooperation), and its occurrence within such large groups that cooperators are not closely related or are even strangers [1-4]. Thus, the long-term social relationships based on kin selection and reciprocity that underlie cooperation in many other animals, particularly other primates, appear to be insufficient to account for the evolution of cooperation in humans [1-4].

One potential solution to this puzzle is that high levels of lethal competition between groups (i.e., warfare) may have played a key role in the evolution of the unique facets of human cooperation [5-8]. A large body of empirical research suggests that humans pay special attention to in-group membership when cooperating [9-11], while theory suggests that altruistic cooperation can evolve via between-group competition provided that groups containing a higher proportion of altruists out-reproduce groups with fewer altruists more quickly than non-altruists out-reproduce altruists within groups [12]. For this process to occur, there should be sufficiently high levels of genetic differentiation between groups so that there are large differences among groups in the fraction of altruists that they contain. While the homogenizing effects of between-group migration would appear to make this scenario unlikely [13,14], it is only recently that attempts have been made to assess the role of between-group competition in the evolution of human cooperation using empirical data. Bowles [15,16] estimated levels of mortality due to between-group competition as well as levels of between-group genetic differentiation in contemporary and recently living hunter-

gatherers, and concluded that altruistic cooperation could evolve in humans if similar conditions applied during the period when this behaviour evolved (presumably the Late Pleistocene).

However, there are several limitations to our understanding of between-group genetic differentiation in humans that limit our ability to evaluate the role of between-group competition in the evolution of human cooperation. First, as his benchmark value of between-group genetic differentiation, Bowles [15] used the median F_{ST} values from a number of studies that assayed genetic variation using a variety of different marker systems, including Y-chromosome and mitochondrial DNA. In contrast to biparentally-inherited autosomal markers, such uniparentally-inherited markers can be very poor indicators of patterns of genome-wide genetic differentiation, and thus of the assortment of altruistic alleles within and between groups, if between-group migration is female- or male-biased, respectively, as typically occurs in human societies [17,18]. Second, most groups in these studies were separated by such large distances that they were very unlikely to have interacted. However, groups tend to be further away from one another and exchange fewer migrants the longer the time since they split from a common ancestral population, and so the amount of between group genetic differentiation usually increases with geographical distance [19-21]. Thus, it is currently unknown if levels of between-group genetic differentiation measured at the more local scale at which most between-group competition occurs are sufficiently high for the evolution of altruistic cooperation in humans. Third, we have very little understanding of how levels of genetic differentiation between local competing human groups compare to those of other group-living animals. This comparison is important because any compelling explanation of the

83 evolution of human cooperation must also explain why other animals do not display the
84 unique features of human cooperation.

85 Chimpanzees represent a particularly relevant test for the human between-group
86 competition model, as they are one of humanity's two closest living relatives and
87 represent the base-level of relatively simple, reciprocity- and kinship-based cooperation
88 from which human cooperation evolved [22,23]. Like humans, chimpanzees are one of
89 the few species in which members of one group make lethal coalitionary attacks against
90 members of other groups, a behaviour that has long drawn attention for its similarity to
91 warfare or raiding in traditional human societies [24,25]. Although direct comparisons are
92 difficult, the available evidence suggests that the fitness consequences of between-group
93 competition are as high in chimpanzees as they are in humans; for example, the fraction
94 of adult mortality due to between-group violence in chimpanzees may match [26] or even
95 exceed [27] that of humans living in traditional societies. However, whether levels of
96 genetic differentiation between competing groups are higher in humans than chimpanzees
97 is unknown, as almost all studies on genetic differentiation in chimpanzees have been
98 conducted at broad geographical scales [28,29] or have used uniparentally inherited
99 markers [30,31], and thus suffer from the same limitations as the data used in Bowles'
100 [15,16] models.

101 There are several reasons to suspect that levels of genetic differentiation between
102 competing groups may be higher in humans than in other primates. The first stems from
103 the fact that in contrast to most non-human primates, humans have a hierarchical social
104 structure, where multiple local groups are subsumed within a larger ethnolinguistic group
105 that shares a common language, culture, and ethnic identity [32]. Ethnographic evidence

suggests that most people marry within their ethnolinguistic group [33], and genetic evidence indicates that ethnolinguistic identity predicts genetic differentiation between groups independently of the effects of geographical distance and barriers [19-21]. The second is that while dispersal in non-human primates usually involves a single individual or small number of individuals dispersing from their natal group to join a nearby, established group [34], in humans whole groups can engage in long-distance migrations to settle new lands. This process can lead to competition between neighboring groups whose genetic differentiation is elevated due to the previous long-distance geographical separation between them. While a similar phenomenon occurs in chimpanzees when the extinction of geographically intermediate groups brings previously separated groups into competition [35,36], its frequency and scale throughout evolutionary history is likely lower than in humans.

Here we determine whether levels of autosomal genetic differentiation between local human groups reach the levels previously suggested [15,16] as sufficient to allow the evolution of unique facets of human cooperation via group competition, and further examine whether values in humans exceed those in chimpanzees. In an attempt to compensate for the necessity of using samples of contemporary humans to infer levels of between-group genetic differentiation that existed during the time period when human cooperation evolved, we examined between-group genetic differentiation in a large sample of many different types of human societies across the world. While previous studies [15,16] only considered hunter-gatherers, it has been argued that recent hunter-gatherers live in more marginal habitats than those of Pleistocene hunter-gatherers, whose resource-rich habitats (e.g., oceanic coasts) may have resulted in higher levels of

sedentism, population density, polygyny, and endogamy that are more similar to those of contemporary food-producing societies [37,38]. Thus, rather than limiting our comparisons to hunter-gatherers, we also examined levels of between-group genetic differentiation in traditional (i.e., non-industrialized) food-producing human societies. As a further step towards ensuring that our sample of contemporary human groups was representative of the full range of between-group genetic differentiation values possibly characteristic of Pleistocene hunter-gatherers, we also performed additional tests where we limited comparisons to pairs of human groups that belonged to different ethnolinguistic groups and spoke languages belonging to different language families.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

We used autosomal microsatellite genotypes to estimate levels of genetic differentiation between potentially competing groups of chimpanzees and humans. Using DNA extracted from feces [39], we genotyped 19 autosomal loci in 486 individuals from 18 chimpanzee groups from 3 locations (Figure 1). Genotypes from five chimpanzee groups were previously published [22,40-42], while genotypes for 13 groups were newly generated for this study. We used a two-step amplification method, where all 19 loci were combined with template DNA in an initial multiplex PCR reaction, with dilutions of the resultant PCR products subsequently amplified in singleplex PCR reactions using fluorescently labeled forward primers and unlabelled nested reverse primers [43]. We performed the necessary number of PCR replications to produce error rates of $< 1\%$, as established in previous work [43]. Eleven of the chimpanzee groups were habituated or semi-habituated to human observation, facilitating the collection of fecal samples from

identified adult individuals. In the remaining seven unhabituated chimpanzee groups, genotypes were assigned to individuals and individuals assigned to groups following procedures described in [42]. We classified as potentially competing 25 pairs of chimpanzee groups that were separated from one another by ≤ 20 km, as determined by the centre of their sampling locations (unhabituated groups) or the centre of their territory (habituated groups).

We used published autosomal microsatellite genotypes to measure levels of genetic differentiation between potentially competing human groups (Africans [44,45], Aboriginal Australians [46], Pacific islanders [47], and Native Americans [48]). Details of the laboratory procedures followed to produce autosomal genotypes are provided in the individual publications. Because the seafaring technology that would have allowed frequent competition between groups separated by oceans likely did not evolve until late in the Holocene, we only considered human groups that occupied the same land mass. Distances between human groups were determined by their sampling location, or if unavailable, the centre of their traditional territory. As the geographical scale at which most between-group competition occurred during the period when human altruism evolved is unknown, we examined several different cut-off points for potentially competing human groups: those separated by ≤ 100 km, ≤ 200 km, ≤ 300 km, ≤ 400 km, and ≤ 500 km. As expected, we found the highest levels of between-group genetic differentiation among potentially competing groups when we included pairs separated by up to 500 km. As we found that between-group genetic differentiation was not higher in humans than chimpanzees even when including human groups separated by up to 500 km (see results section below), we do not present the results for the more geographically

175 restrictive classifications of potentially competing human groups, even if it is more likely
176 that most competition occurs at these more local scales, particularly among direct
177 neighbors.

178 Genetic differentiation between groups was calculated using D [49] and F_{ST} [50].
179 D measures the actual relative degree of differentiation of allele frequencies among the
180 groups of a population. F_{ST} , in contrast, was designed to estimate one of the causes of
181 differences in allele frequencies between groups, the amount of migration (other factors
182 include mutation rate, bottlenecks, founder effects, etc.). Unlike F_{ST} , which is
183 mathematically bound by the amount of within-population diversity, D increases
184 monotonically with increasing levels of allelic differentiation. Thus, D is a more
185 appropriate measure to approximate the assortment of altruistic alleles within- and
186 between-groups, and we used D values for statistical comparisons of levels of between-
187 group genetic differentiation in chimpanzees versus humans.

188 We used a bootstrapping procedure to assess the statistical significance of
189 differences in the mean of pairwise between-group D values of chimpanzees and humans.
190 Here we generated 95% confidence intervals (C.I.s) by calculating means based on
191 10,000 resamples (with replacement) of the pairwise D values, and determined the
192 statistical significance of differences by examination of the overlap of the 95% C.I.s. We
193 also repeated all of our analyses with F_{ST} , but as they did not qualitatively change any of
194 our conclusions concerning average levels of between-group genetic differentiation in
195 chimpanzees versus humans, we only report F_{ST} when making comparisons with the F_{ST}
196 values used by Bowles in his earlier work on this topic. In addition to comparing average
197 pairwise F_{ST} , we also examine the percentage of pairwise F_{ST} values in chimpanzees and

our newly assembled human data sets that are as large or larger than the benchmark value Bowles used in his original work on this topic (0.076, [15]), as well as the minimum value he considered in subsequent work (0.022, [16]). We make these comparisons because it is possible that although chimpanzees and humans do not differ in average pairwise genetic differentiation, values that are sufficiently high for the evolution of altruism may occur more frequently in humans than in chimpanzees.

We compare levels of between-group genetic differentiation in chimpanzees with three sets of human groups: (1) both groups in a dyadic comparison are hunter-gatherers (HG-HG comparisons), (2) both groups are food-producers (FP-FP), and (3) one group is a hunter-gatherer and the other group is a food-producer (HG-FP). We repeated each of these comparisons with restricted human data sets that only included pairs of groups that belonged to different ethnolinguistic groups and spoke languages belonging to different language families.

The ethnolinguistic identities, language families and subsistence systems of human groups were determined from information reported in the original publications from which we got the genetic data, and along with human and chimpanzee D and F_{ST} values, are reported in the Electronic Supplementary Material. Despite the fact that African Pygmies typically speak languages that combine their native tongues with those of their immediate non-Pygmy neighbours [51], we classified all pairs of African Pygmy groups as having languages of the same language family, and all Pygmy/non-Pygmy pairs as having languages of different language families, as we felt that this classification would more closely reflect the purpose of the language family variable, namely, to assay

levels of genetic differentiation between groups where large cultural differences may inhibit between-group migration.

3. RESULTS

Overall, we found that genetic differentiation was the same or greater between pairs of chimpanzee groups than between human groups (Figure 2). Using D , the most appropriate measure of genetic differentiation for assaying the assortment of altruistic alleles within- and between-groups, we found that average genetic differentiation was significantly higher in chimpanzees ($D = 0.076$, 95% C.I. = 0.063 - 0.088, $N = 25$ pairs of groups) than in hunter-gatherers ($D = 0.040$, 95% C.I. = 0.035 - 0.045, $N = 253$). The average D of hunter-gatherers doubled to 0.085 when comparisons were made only between groups with different ethnolinguistic affiliations and speaking languages belonging to different families, but did not significantly differ (95% C.I. = 0.073 - 0.099, $N = 14$) from that of chimpanzees. Similarly, although genetic differentiation was higher in hunter-gatherer/food-producer ($D = 0.068$, 95% C.I. = 0.065 - 0.071, $N = 223$) and food-producer/food-producer ($D = 0.075$, 95% C.I. = 0.071 - 0.078, $N = 539$) comparisons than in hunter-gather/hunter-gatherer comparisons, in neither of these sets of groups were average D values significantly higher than in chimpanzees. Unlike in the hunter-gatherer/hunter-gatherer comparisons, average D values among hunter-gatherer/food-producer ($D = 0.068$, 95% C.I. = 0.065 - 0.071, $N = 178$) and food producer/food-producer ($D = 0.080$, 95% C.I. = 0.076 - 0.085, $N = 254$) comparisons did not substantially increase when restricted to comparisons of groups with different ethnolinguistic affiliations and speaking languages from different families.

Very similar results were obtained with the more widely used estimator of genetic differentiation, F_{ST} (Table 1). The average genetic differentiation of hunter-gatherers was once again low, and values for none of the sets of human groups were higher than among chimpanzees. Notably, human pairwise F_{ST} values rarely reached levels used in prior assessment of the models exploring the potential for the evolution of human cooperation via between-group competition [15,16] (Table 1). It was actually more common for chimpanzees to reach the minimum pairwise F_{ST} value (0.022) recently suggested necessary for the evolution of altruism [16] than it was for hunter-gatherer/hunter-gather and hunter-gatherer/food-producer pairs. Only in food-producer/food-producer pairs was the percentage of pairwise comparisons that met the minimum value of 0.022 higher than in chimpanzees.

4. DISCUSSION

Using the measure of genetic differentiation (D) most appropriate for interpopulation and interspecies comparisons, we showed that average levels of small-scale genetic differentiation between human groups, even when limited to groups exhibiting marked cultural differences, are not higher than levels observed in chimpanzees. In addition, while individual pairwise estimates of F_{ST} infrequently reached threshold levels deemed sufficient for the evolution of cooperation via group competition [15,16], this occurred in both humans and chimpanzees with no consistent difference between the two species. The apparent lack of higher local genetic differentiation in humans relative to chimpanzees is surprising given our expectations based on how cultural barriers to between-group migration could lead to higher levels of genetic differentiation between local competing groups of humans than chimpanzees. However, it is also important to consider how other differences between the

species could produce the opposite effect. Of particular relevance in this regard is the lower level of autosomal genetic variation in humans than chimpanzees, likely due to a bottleneck at the recent origin of *Homo sapiens* some 200 kya, which may limit the extent of differentiation in allele frequencies between groups that have all recently diverged from the same source population [29].

Our results, while suggesting that between-group genetic differentiation in contemporary humans is not greater than in chimpanzees, do not necessarily disprove the hypothesis that high levels of competition between genetically differentiated groups led to the evolution of the unique aspects of human cooperation. Although we found that the frequency of pairwise genetic differentiation values thought to be sufficient for the evolution of altruistic cooperation was not markedly higher in contemporary humans than in chimpanzees, even when comparisons were limited to the most genetically differentiated types of human groups, we cannot definitively rule out the possibility that altruistic cooperation in humans might have evolved due to the existence of occasional or even single instances of high genetic differentiation of an isolated population. In addition, although we have attempted to infer levels of between-group genetic differentiation present at the critical time of the evolution of human cooperation in the Late Pleistocene by examining genetic differentiation in a large and diverse sample of contemporary human groups, there is as currently no way of knowing how successful we have been in this regard. This situation may change in the future as improvements in the ability to extract reliable DNA sequence information from ancient remains [52] may eventually permit the analysis of sufficient samples to describe the population structure of the observed diversity.

We suggest that while the direct and indirect fitness benefits that humans derive from between-group competition have likely been important in the evolution of human cooperation, our results imply that additional factors should be considered to explain why cooperation is so different in humans than in other animals, like chimpanzees, who also gain fitness benefits from between-group competition. In his original work on this topic, Bowles [15] argued that unlike non-human primates, where reproduction is skewed towards dominant individuals, humans possess distinctive practices which limit the ability of selfish individuals to outcompete altruists within groups, including culturally-mandated resource and information sharing, consensus decision making, collective restraints on potential aggrandizers, and monogamy. However, as some critics have noted [53,54], these ‘reproductive leveling’ mechanisms may rest on exactly the same altruistic behavior that the model purports to explain, and Bowles’ [16] subsequent model did not include a reproductive leveling term. While it is possible that variance in lifetime reproductive success is lower in humans than in chimpanzees for reasons that do not themselves rely on altruism (i.e, ecological constraints that limit the ability of particular individuals to monopolize fitness-limiting resources), the extremely slow life-history of chimpanzees means that the data necessary to make the necessary comparisons are currently unavailable.

Contemporary humans and chimpanzees differ in their cognitive abilities and capacity for language, and such factors may also have played a role in facilitating the evolution of altruistic cooperation in humans. Humans are noteworthy in the extent to which socially learned, culturally transmitted information leads to between-group variation in adaptive behavior. A number of factors, including the tendency of emigrants

to adopt the cultural traits of their new group, can lead to more cultural than genetic differentiation between human groups [54,55]. In this regard, our results leave open the possibility that both genetic and cultural differentiation between groups played a role in the evolution of altruistic cooperation [1-3,54,55].

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank S. Pääbo for comments on an earlier version of the manuscript, R. Mundry for statistical assistance, S. Tüpke for assistance with the figures, C. Boesch for discussion and for facilitating collection of Tai chimpanzee samples, J. Mitani, D. Watts, J. Lwanga, J. Lloyd, the Uganda Wildlife Authority and the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology for facilitating collection of Ngogo and Kanyanchu chimpanzee samples, and J. Friedlaender, F. Friedlaender, P. Verdu, J. Buckleton and S. Walsh for providing detailed human genetic data. The manuscript was greatly improved by the comments of two anonymous referees and R. Bshary. This research was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Max Planck Society, the National Science Foundation (USA), the Leakey Foundation, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and the Cleveland Metroparks Zoo.

6. REFERENCES

1. Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. 1996 Culture and the evolution of human social instincts. In *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition, and Interaction* (eds. N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson), pp. 453-477. New York: Berg.

- 333 2. Henrich, J. 2004 Cultural group selection, coevolutionary processes and large-scale
334 cooperation. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 53, 3-35.
- 335 3. Henrich, J. & Henrich, N. 2004 Culture, evolution and the puzzle of human
336 cooperation. *Cognitive systems Research* 7, 220-245.
337 (10.1016/j.cogsys.2005.11.010)
- 338 4. Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. 1988 The evolution of reciprocity in sizable groups. *J.*
339 *Theor. Biol.* 132, 337-356.
- 340 5. van der Dennen, J. 1999 Human evolution and the origin of war: a Darwinian heritage.
341 In *The Darwinian Heritage and Sociobiology* (eds. J. van der Dennen, D. Smillie
342 & D. Wilson), pp. 163–186. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- 343 6. Darwin, C. 1871 *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Princeton:
344 Princeton University Press.
- 345 7. Wilson, E. O. 1975 *Sociobiology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of
346 Harvard University Press.
- 347 8. Alexander, R. D. & Borgia, G. 1978 Group selection, altruism, and levels of
348 organization of life. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 9, 449-474.
- 349 9. Bernhard, H., Fischbacher, U. & Fehr, E. 2006 Parochial altruism in humans. *Nature*
350 442, 912-915. (10.1038/nature04981)
- 351 10. Efferson, C., Lalive, R. & Fehr, E. 2008 The coevolution of cultural groups and
352 ingroup favoritism. *Science* 321, 1844-1849. (10.1126/science.1155805)
- 353 11. Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R. & Sherif, C. W. 1988 *The*
354 *Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*. Middletown:
355 Wesleyan University Press.

- 356 12. Wilson, D. S. 1997 Evolution - Human groups as units of selection. *Science* 276,
357 1816-1817.
- 358 13. Maynard Smith, J. 1964 Group selection and kin selection. *Nature* 201, 145-147
- 359 14. Williams, G. C. 1966 *Adaptation and Natural Selection*. Princeton, New Jersey:
360 Princeton University Press.
- 361 15. Bowles, S. 2006 Group competition, reproductive leveling, and the evolution of
362 human altruism. *Science* 314, 1569-1572. (10.1126/science.1134829)
- 363 16. Bowles, S. 2009 Did warfare among ancestral hunter-gatherers affect the evolution of
364 human social behaviors? *Science* 324, 1293-1298. (10.1126/science.1168112)
- 365 17. Mesa, N. R., Mondragon, M. C., Soto, I. D., Parra, M. V., Duque, C., Ortiz-
366 Barrientos, D., Garcia, L. F., Velez, I. D., Bravo, M. L., Munera, J. G., *et al.* 2000
367 Autosomal, mtDNA, and Y-chromosome diversity in Amerinds: Pre- and post-
368 Columbian patterns of gene flow in South America. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 67, 1277-
369 1286.
- 370 18. Murdoch, G. P. 1981 *Atlas of World Cultures* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh
371 Press.
- 372 19. Heyer, E., Balaesque, P., Jobling, M. A., Quintana-Murci, L., Chaix, R., Segurel, L.,
373 Aldashev, A. & Hegay, T. 2009 Genetic diversity and the emergence of ethnic
374 groups in Central Asia. *Bmc Genetics* 10, (4910.1186/1471-2156-10-49)
- 375 20. Manica, A., Prugnolle, F. & Balloux, F. 2005 Geography is a better determinant of
376 human genetic differentiation than ethnicity. *Hum. Genet.* 118, 366-371.
377 (10.1007/s00439-005-0039-3)

- 378 21. Sokal, R. R. 1988 Genetic, geographic, and linguistic distances in Europe. *Proc. Natl.*
379 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 85, 1722-1726.
- 380 22. Langergraber, K. E., Mitani, J. C. & Vigilant, L. 2007 The limited impact of kinship
381 on cooperation in wild chimpanzees. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 104, 7786-
382 7790. (10.1073/pnas.0611449104)
- 383 23. Muller, M. N. & Mitani, J. C. 2005 Conflict and cooperation in wild chimpanzees.
384 *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 35, 275-331.
- 385 24. Crofoot, M. C. & Wrangham, R. W. 2010 Intergroup aggression in primates and
386 humans: the case for a unified theory. In *Mind the Gap: Tracing the Origins of*
387 *Human Universals* (eds. P. M. Kappeler & J. B. Silk), pp. 171-195. Berlin:
388 Springer.
- 389 25. Wrangham, R. W. 1999 Evolution of coalitionary killing. *Yearbook of Physical*
390 *Anthropology* 42, 1-30.
- 391 26. Wrangham, R. W., Wilson, M. L. & Muller, M. N. 2006 Comparative rates of
392 violence in chimpanzees and humans. *Primates* 47, 14-26. (10.1007/s10329-005-
393 0140-1)
- 394 27. Mitani, J. C., Watts, D. P. & Amstler, S. J. 2010 Lethal intergroup aggression leads to
395 territorial expansion in wild chimpanzees. 20, R507-R508.
- 396 28. Becquet, C., Patterson, N., Stone, A. C., Przeworski, M. & Reich, D. 2007 Genetic
397 structure of chimpanzee populations. *Plos Genetics* 3, (e66
398 10.1371/journal.pgen.0030066)
- 399 29. Fischer, A., Pollack, J., Thalmann, O., Nickel, B. & Paabo, S. 2006 Demographic
400 history and genetic differentiation in apes. *Curr. Biol.* 16, 1133-1138.

- 401 30. Langergraber, K. E., Siedel, H., Mitani, J. C., Wrangham, R. W., Reynolds, V., Hunt,
402 K. D. & Vigilant, L. 2007 The genetic signature of sex-biased migration in
403 patrilocal chimpanzees and humans. *PLoS One* 10, e973.
404 (10.1371/journal.pone.0000973)
- 405 31. Gonder, M. K., Disotell, T. R. & Oates, J. F. 2006 New genetic evidence on the
406 evolution of chimpanzee populations and implications for taxonomy.
407 *International Journal of Primatology* 27, 1103-1127. (10.1007/s10764-006-9063-
408 y)
- 409 32. Rodseth, L., Wrangham, R. W., Harrigan, A. M. & Smuts, B. B. 1991 The human
410 community as a primate society. *Curr. Anthropol.* 32, 221-254.
- 411 33. Fox, R. F. 1967 *Kinship and Marriage*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- 412 34. Di Fiore, A. 2003 Molecular genetic approaches to the study of primate behavior,
413 social organization, and reproduction. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* 46, 62-
414 99. (10.1002/ajpa.10382)
- 415 35. Goodall, J. 1986 *The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behavior*. Cambridge:
416 Harvard University Press.
- 417 36. Nishida, T., Hiraiwa-Hasegawa, M., Hasegawa, K. & Y., T. 1985 Group extinction
418 and female transfer in wild chimpanzees in the Mahale Mountains National Park,
419 Tanzania. *Z. Tierpsychol.* 67, 281-301.
- 420 37. MacDonald, D. H. & Hewlett, B. S. 1999 Reproductive interests and forager mobility.
421 *Curr. Anthropol.* 40, 501-523.
- 422 38. Marlowe, F. W. 2005 Hunter-gatherers and human evolution. *Evol. Anthropol.* 14,
423 54-67. (10.1002/evan.20046)

- 424 39. Nsubuga, A. M., Robbins, M. M., Roeder, A. D., Morin, P. A., Boesch, C. &
425 Vigilant, L. 2004 Factors affecting the amount of genomic DNA extracted from
426 ape faeces and the identification of an improved sample storage method. *Mol.*
427 *Ecol.* 13, 2089-2094. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2004.02207.x)
- 428 40. Langergraber, K., Mitani, J. & Vigilant, L. 2009 Kinship and social bonds in female
429 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Am. J. Primatol.* 71, 840-851.
430 (10.1002/ajp.20711)
- 431 41. Lukas, D., Reynolds, V., Boesch, C. & Vigilant, L. 2005 To what extent does living
432 in a group mean living with kin? *Mol. Ecol.* 14, 2181-2196. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-
433 294X.2005.02560.x)
- 434 42. Schubert, G., Stoneking, C., Arandjelovic, M., Boesch, C., Eckhardt, N., Hohmann,
435 G., Langergraber, K., Lukas, D. & Vigilant, L. In review Male-mediated gene
436 flow in patrilocal primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*
- 437 43. Arandjelovic, M., Guschanski, K., Schubert, G., Harris, T. R., Thalmann, O., Siedel,
438 H. & Vigilant, L. 2009 Two-step multiplex polymerase chain reaction improves
439 the speed and accuracy of genotyping using DNA from noninvasive and museum
440 samples. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 9, 28-36. (10.1111/j.1755-
441 0998.2008.02387.x)
- 442 44. Tishkoff, S. A., Reed, F. A., Friedlaender, F. R., Ehret, C., Ranciaro, A., Froment, A.,
443 Hirbo, J. B., Awomoyi, A. A., Bodo, J. M., Doumbo, O., *et al.* 2009 The genetic
444 structure and history of Africans and African Americans. *Science* 324, 1035-1044.
445 (10.1126/science.1172257)

- 446 45. Verdu, P., Austerlitz, F., Estoup, A., Vitalis, R., Georges, M., Thery, S., Froment, A.,
447 Le Bomin, S., Gessain, A., Hombert, J. M., *et al.* 2009 Origins and genetic
448 diversity of Pygmy hunter-gatherers from western central Africa. *Curr. Biol.* 19,
449 312-318. (10.1016/j.cub.2008.12.049)
- 450 46. Walsh, S. J., Mitchell, R. J., Watson, N. & Buckleton, J. S. 2007 A comprehensive
451 analysis of microsatellite diversity in Aboriginal Australians. *J. Hum. Genet.* 52,
452 712-728. (10.1007/s10038-007-0172-z)
- 453 47. Friedlaender, J. S., Friedlaender, F. R., Reed, F. A., Kidd, K. K., Kidd, J. R.,
454 Chambers, G. K., Lea, R. A., Loo, J. H., Koki, G., Hodgson, J. A., *et al.* 2008 The
455 genetic structure of Pacific islanders. *Plos Genetics* 4, (e19
456 10.1371/journal.pgen.0040019)
- 457 48. Wang, S., Lewis, C. M., Jakobsson, M., Ramachandran, S., Ray, N., Bedoya, G.,
458 Rojas, W., Parra, M. V., Molina, J. A., Gallo, C., *et al.* 2007 Genetic variation and
459 population structure in Native Americans. *Plos Genetics* 3, 2049-2067. (e185
460 10.1371/journal.pgen.0030185)
- 461 49. Jost, L. 2008 G(ST) and its relatives do not measure differentiation. *Mol. Ecol.* 17,
462 4015-4026. (10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03887.x)
- 463 50. Nei, M. 1973 Analysis of gene diversity in subdivided populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
464 *Sci. U. S. A.* 70, 3321-3323.
- 465 51. Grinker, R. R. 1994 *Houses in the Rainforest: Ethnicity and Inequality among*
466 *Farmers and Foragers in Central Africa*. Berkeley: University of California
467 Press.

- 468 52. Krause, J., Briggs A.W., Kirchner, M., Maricic, T., Zwyns, N., Derevianko, A.,
469 Pääbo, S. 2010 A complete mtDNA genome of an early modern human from
470 Kostenki, Russia. *Curr. Biol.* 20, 231-236 (10.1016/j.cub.2009.11.068) l.
- 471 53. Boyd, R. 2006 The puzzle of human sociality. *Science* 314, 1555-1556.
- 472 54. Bell, A. V., Richerson, P. J. & McElreath, R. 2009 Culture rather than genes provides
473 greater scope for the evolution of large-scale human prosociality. *Proc. Natl.*
474 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 106, 17671-17674. (10.1073/pnas.0903232106)
- 475 55. Richerson, P. J. & Boyd, R. P. D. 2005 *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture*
476 *Transformed Human Evolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 477

TABLE AND FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Locations of chimpanzee groups. Number of individuals genotyped per group are shown in brackets.

Figure 2. Average pairwise D values (and 95% C.I.s) of chimpanzee (empty bars) and human groups (grey bars) with different combinations of subsistence systems. Sample sizes (number of pairs of groups) are shown in brackets. For humans, light grey bars represent values for all pairs of groups, and dark grey bars represent values for the restricted sample consisting only of pairs of groups belonging to different ethnolinguistic groups and speaking languages belonging to different language families. HG: hunter-gatherer, FP: food-producer.

Table 1. F_{ST} values in chimpanzee and human groups practicing different forms of subsistence. Shown are the sample sizes (number of pairs of groups) and averages of the pairwise F_{ST} values, along with the percentage of pairwise F_{ST} values that reach those used in Bowles' models. For humans, values are shown for all pairs of groups and for the restricted sample consisting only of pairs of groups belonging to different ethnolinguistic groups and speaking languages belonging to different language families. HG: hunter-gatherer, FP: food-producer.

Table 1.

	N	Mean F_{ST}	% $F_{ST} \geq 0.022$	% $F_{ST} \geq 0.076$
Chimpanzees	25	0.014	8.0	0.0
All HG/HG	253	0.005	1.2	0.4
Restricted HG/HG	14	0.013	0.0	0.0
All HG/FP	223	0.011	0.9	0.9
Restricted HG/FP	178	0.010	0.0	0.0
All FP/FP	539	0.015	23.6	0.2
Restricted FP/FP	254	0.015	23.2	0.0



